

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,448	12/04/2000	Joseph A. Porkka	MS150750.1	6259
27195	7590 09/30/2004		EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP			ROCHE, TRENTON J	
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET		NTER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	O, OH 44114		2124	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/729,448	PORKKA, JOSEPH	A.
7.12.700.7	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Trent J Roche	2124	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicate) at imely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amounth the shortened statutory period for reply once later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION.  R 1.136(a) and the apprunt of the fee. The apportionally set in the final	on. See MPEP copriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 August 2004. Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			rth in
2. $\square$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	•	
<ul> <li>(c)    they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	ıs.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	, ,	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,7-25			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b)  disapproved by t	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	, , , , , ,		•

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner does not see any distinction between a "virtual build machine process" executing on a single computer along with the first and second component as in the present invention, and the system disclosed by Boehm et al. In the case of the "virtual build machine processes," the single computer would still be linking and distributing files to itself, as the virtual build machine processes are executing on the single computer. Regardless of how futile or unnecessary the actions may be, as was shown in the prior office actions, Boehm et al discloses a first component, second component, and storing of the files locally. The rejections of claims 1-4 and 7-25 are maintained.

Karan' Char

KAKALI CHANI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100